IowAccess
Project 14 Team Meeting
July 24, 1997

Present: Harold Templeman and Deb Westvold, Chairs; Larry Allen, Joan Discher, Judy Dierenfeld, Hollis Hensley, Marge Knudsen, Victor Elias, Steve Kerber, Linda Plazak, Dennis Dykstra for Jeananne Hagen, Arlinda McKeen and Deb Kazmerzak, Staff. ICN or remote participants: Tom Bouska, Council Bluffs; Barb Rohland, Iowa City; Max Smith, Katie Steele, Kansas.

I. Project Plan Review

Each project team is to consider and respond to comments made by the IowAccess Steering Committee

Project 14 comments included the issue of the seamless plan – what does that mean? Seamless means that the consumer doesn't have to know or be bothered with all the ins and outs of what agency, provides a service -- you can access the information/service from multiple points or more easily. County information will likely remain county information, but it will be easier to access.

There was a comment about Part 8 of the plan – the evaluation component is not administered until July. We just need to build in some evaluation process earlier – I don't think that's a big issue.

Section 10 – we are expected to strengthen the citizen input. Not sure what to do with this – consumers won't really know that this system exists, so what do we need to do about this issue?

If you look at private sector representation on this committee, I do believe there is some citizen input. The public meetings offer another opportunity for the citizen input.

Those were basically the comments received on the plan. Does anyone else have comments or questions on the plan? Harold and Deb will make the changes and submit the finished plan.

II. Work plan review

Are there questions about the steps outlined in the work plan? The second page of the work plan is really where the guts of it start. At the top of the page there are a number of things that we're dealing with today. There's an assumption that we'll need to do an RFP for bids to design the system that will design and install at the state and pilot counties.

The time frames are ambitious – we will be having meetings and review if this works well – we had it compressed and learned that it was not compressed enough. Its on the fast track to get it organized and started.

How will counties be selected? Responses will come to ISAC, we've already been approached by interested counties.

Decisions have not yet been made on selection criteria.   May want to select counties that are pretty advanced in data collection already

We'll need to fit in the actual selection into the work plan -- we may use team members to participate in that selection process.

III. Budget Review

We don't need to spend a lot of time here – we don't have much budget, and it will be spent fairly simply, primarily to hire consultants to do the software kind of stuff that has to be done. We tried to make some guesses as to how that might break down. If anyone has better ideas as to how to spend it or break it down, we'd be glad to hear it.

IV.   Determine Contents of the RFP

A. What data will be included in the system

There is a minimum data set that counties are expected to have – beyond that it might vary. This data set generally contains some service approval, services received, some payment information, and demographics. It was designed as a collaboration between state/counties for the purposes of planning and tracking services. It's fairly basic information.

Might want to build in some kind of tracker for a diagnostic code. Might want to target services to meet needs of service groups not receiving services. If it is something esoteric, people won't feel compelled to enter the data. Three important things – provider code, diagnostic code, and service code.

A brief run down of the form -- who they are; where they live; county of legal settlement; primary disability code (DD, MR, MI, CMI); primary source of income; additional insurance; service information; what the person has been approved for and for what amount; waiting list information and why waiting; dates of application and dates of service; who the provider was; where the service was provided; how many units of service were received, etc.

Linda Plazak asked that the data definitions be made available.

Current state systems.:
Title XIX, POS (state case), SRS, FACS, CEO data

There are no links to federal systems.

Some discussion about Medicare and substance abuse systems, and the determination that they should be looked into for this project

The key is the data elements, regardless of what system you draw the data from.

B. Determine how data can be used

We've talked about different ways the data can be used and accessed. For people who are responsible for determining eligibility for services, the idea is they would have access to the information so they could look to see if the person is receiving services someplace else or has received services someplace else.

A longer range goal is that a person walks into the county CPC office and makes application – the CPC can determine whether they are receiving services anywhere in the state, and could actually take the application for Medicaid. CPC could use it to determine legal settlement.

When we get into more case specific information we get into what kind of authorization will be needed. De-identified information should be available for planning.

Citizen groups might be more interested in aggregate financial data that will be easier to access rather than having to go to DOM. We assume there will be access to demographic information that would be of benefit, that can be available by different areas of the state.

C. Determine where data will be stored

According to Lorrie Tritch (DHS), the department has a consultant under contract to do some work. They had 3 or 4 different ideas as to how this system might work. That's something we have to follow up on. There is a strong possibility that we can use the Department's system as the backbone. We have an area wide network that reaches into all 99 counties. The issue then becomes access, where ever the information is at. The system has to be set up so that the users have access.

Is it stored somewhere central or is it stored at the county level to be downloaded into the system periodically? That would enable the local level to freely access their own data. There is talk about the difficulty in being able to access information that is stored at DHS – you can't get it back, even though the information is there. The question might be who has control of the access, or if it is a design problem with the DHS system.

Linda Plazak -- An option you might want to look at is that through project 1 we'll have a database server – this should be something that is easy to access. If you put it in an ACCESS or Oracle database, you can get the information whenever and where ever you want it. Keep in the back of your minds that this will be an option From a customer point of view, getting the information. out of a warehouse is easier than getting it out of a mainframe. The state hasn't done the best job possible because of the platform available. Hopefully project 1 will provide the platform.

The intent is not to replace a system that currently exists. Counties and the state would still have their systems, but periodically, both would update and store the information in a storage unit.

The issue is where you get at it from the front end – technically it doesn't make a difference where it is stored. It's how friendly the front end is that makes it possible to access the data. The speed with which the information is available is also important to consider, and depends on where it is stored

Data definition may pose a problem -- state and counties use some different definitions, although it should not be a major problem due to many similarities.

The RFP should require that the consultant meet with a bunch of users of varying degrees of sophistication – CPC's, DHS workers, to see what they want/ need from the system. We do need to be as specific as we can be with the contractor, but we have limited time to do this. The deadline for getting an RFP out is looming. Since DHS has a contractor, can we use them rather than going out for bids? *I would think you could amend your current contract to include this piece. (Linda Plazak).*

D. Determine how the data will be accessed

** Need a subgroup to work on the issues for the RFP.

In terms of who can use the data – everyone that can use the data has an ID code which can be tracked, so if someone is using the information inappropriately that would be tracked. A person has to make application to be able to have access.

We have two levels – one that is very client specific – there will be limited access to that. The broader, de-identified or demographic information will be accessible to more people.

Linda Plazak – Suggestion is that you need to talk to the front-line people that gather and enter the data. If you do the front line information, the rest of it will be there for you. Whoever is managing the information can create the aggregate data.

What about the issue of releases of information? The assumption is that there are methods to build into the system that address the issue of whether or not there is a signed release. That is a big issue for the vendor.

ITS is approaching the legislature with the digital signature – might come in handy in this case.

There are varying degrees of access -- those with a need for more confidential information have full access -- those with need for aggregate data have a lesser level.

Those with access -- ISAC, DHS—Hoover, local DHS level (unsure) --it is people who would have access today– outside of that, no one additionally would have access. The demographic information. should be accessible to anyone – consumer groups, etc. should be able to access the information..

Supervisors will want aggregate data at the county level also.

ITS will be responsible for the hardware issues. Internet will be the medium most used. Project 1 will be responsible for making sure security is addressed when using the internet.

Pilot counties need to have local dial in internet access.

RFP committee – Vic, Larry, need to talk to Lorrie Tritch, Jim Day (ITS), Steve will serve in a commenting / reality check capacity

V. Criteria for selection of counties

local dial in access
more sophisticated capabilities

COMIS and non-COMIS
rural/urban
commitment from pilots to be willing to share experiences with other counties
data collector people need to be available to help select the counties

Pilot counties will be selected through a letter -- the word is already out via ISAC. Won't be issuing a RFP. Will use the team for selecting

VI. Set meeting schedule

August 18 and fourth Mondays thereafter.   1:30 - 3:30 . same sites

VII. Other

By what means do you want to receive information? Please complete and return the form.
Those at the remote sites were asked
Barb – email
Max - combination -- agenda's mailed, information. in between email is fine

Media packets were passed out with the request to use them locally.